

**REMARKS**

This Response submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 22, 2010, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Rejection of claims 1-19, and 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-19, and 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (US 5,408,520) in view of Holmstrom (US 6,907,265).

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites:

A method of **supplying configuration data to a mobile telephony device** equipped with AT command management means, the method comprising: i) setting up a connection between said device and **a terminal containing service configuration data** and ii) after the setting up the connection, **exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands** that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret.

The Examiner asserts that the combination of Clark and Holmstrom teaches the elements of claim 1.

Clark is directed to a modem for tight coupling between a computer and a cellular telephone. A modem includes connections for land lines and cellular phones and contains high and low level routines that allow it to perform standard AT commands rationally when connected to a cellular phone. See Abstract.

Holmstrom is directed to a system and method for providing a packet-switched connection such as GPRS, to a portable computer of a mobile station. See Abstract.

However, Clark and Holmstrom are not directed to a method of supplying configuration data to a mobile telephony device equipped with AT command management means.

Specifically, Clark and Holmstrom are not directed to supplying configuration data or exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands.

The Examiner asserts on page 2 of the Office Action that the laptop computer 10 as illustrated in Fig. 1B of Clark teaches the claimed terminal, and that the cellular phone 22 teaches the claimed mobile telephony device. Further, the Examiner asserts that the laptop computer 10 is connected to the cellular phone 22, which the Examiner asserts teaches setting up a connection between said device and **a terminal containing service configuration data**, citing col. 6, lines 33-34 in support. Also the Examiner asserts that the laptop computer 10 and the cellular phone 22 exchange service configuration data, which the Examiner asserts teaches after the setting up the connection, **exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands** that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret, citing col. 3, lines 35-37 in support.

The aspect of Clark cited by the Examiner describes the control link between the host computer and the cellular phone. Fig. 1D illustrates the configuration of the laptop computer 10 with the modem 12. The laptop computer 10 is connected to both the cellular phone 22 and the telephone wall outlet 18.

However, Clark does not teach or suggest that configuration data is supplied to the cellular phone 22. Clark merely describes the configuration of the laptop computer 10 with the modem 12, the cellular phone 22 and the telephone wall outlet 18. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion that the laptop 10 (terminal as cited by the Examiner) contains service configuration data or that after setting up the connection, exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion of exchanging service configuration data, as claimed.

The Examiner states on page 3 of the Office Action that Clark does not clearly teach the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret, and cites Holmstrom to cure the deficiency. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Holmstrom discloses an AT command set and setting up the physical links for circuit switching and packet switching, citing aspects of cols. 2-5 in support.

As discussed above, Holmstrom discloses adapting a portable computer to an existing mobile station so as to be instantly capable of supporting packet-switched connections (e.g. GPRS). See col. 1, lines 5-10. Therefore, Holmstrom does not teach or suggest exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret.

Therefore, the combination of Clark and Holmstrom does not teach the elements of claim 1. Consequently, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-8 and 19-27 should be deemed allowable.

To the extent independent claim 9 recites similar subject matter, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-18 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

**Claim 26**

Claim 26 recites, *inter alia*,:

wherein the exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands comprises the terminal receiving at least one of **configuration data defining new profiles for the device or updating profiles already stored in the terminal for the device.**

The Examiner asserts that col. 1, lines 23-38 and col. 2, lines 43-51 of Holmstrom teach this aspect of the claim. The aspects of Holmstrom cited by the Examiner describes the use of AT commands for communicating between a computer and a modem.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed configuration data, let alone, that the configuration data defines new profiles for the device or updating profiles already stored in the terminal for the device.

Therefore, claim 26 should further be deemed allowable.

**II. Rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Holmstrom and further in view of Kobayashi (US 6,633,759). Claim 20 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Moreover, Kobayashi does not cure the deficiencies of Clark and Holmstrom discussed above.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 20, 2010